

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/560,240	Applicant(s) KAISER, DIETMAR	
	Examiner Lucas Stelling	Art Unit 1797	

All Participants:

(1) Lucas Stelling.

(2) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 August 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
none

Claims discussed:
27, 29, 31, and 37

Prior art documents discussed:
Sinz, Widemann, and Harris

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: pending

(3) Frank Compagni, Esq.

(4) _____.

Time: 1:30PM

las 8-10-10

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated that as currently written claim 27 appears to read on Sinz. The examiner suggested incorporating the limitations of claims 29 and 31 into claim 27 in order to define that a water ring pump is coupled to the inlet of the water tank inlet in that the water tank inlet is tangential to the outerwall of the water tank, as Sinz and Widemann do not show a tangential inlet to the water tank which is connected to the water ring pump. Likewise, claim 37 claims a water ring pump with a tangentially oriented water tank inlet being connected to the water ring pump outlet. In further searching the instant case the examiner found Harris, but with respect to claim 27, Harris does not teach or fairly suggest a water tank having a tangential inlet in communication with the water ring pump and defining a water reservoir, and that the separation device defines a mud-water reservoir and is coupled to and disposed at least partially within the water tank and extending into the water tank so that the water tank at least partially surrounds the separation device, the water and mud-water reservoirs being separated by at least one wall of the separation device to prevent direct fluid communication between the water and mud-water reservoirs. And likewise, with respect to claim 37, Harris does not teach or fairly suggest a water tank defining a water reservoir and having a tangential inlet coupled to the water ring pump outlet, and a gravitational separation device defining a mud-water reservoir in a lower portion thereof and coupled to and disposed at least partially within the water tank so that the water tank at least partially surrounds the separation device, the water and mud reservoirs being separated by walls of the separation device to prevent direct fluid communication between the water and mud reservoirs. Applicant agreed to the incorporation of claims 29 and 31 into claim 27 by examiner's amendment.